2:4

e.t.s. journal

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

ets journal

Vol. II, No. 4 May 1956

Contents

The Rev. John Harmon
Revitalizing Roxbury 4

Robert C. S. Deacon
Judas Speaks from the Tree 10

Wm. Brown Patterson
Segregation: A Sermon 13

Charles L. Bennett
The Philosopher and the Ass, or
The Ass and the Philosopher 19

John H. Snow
Koinonia In Cambridge 21

Jeremy H. Knowles
Spoken E.T.S. 23

Edwin B. Stube
Providence and Freedom 25

Editorial Board: Brian Kelley, Chairman; Professor William J. Wolf; John Snow, Treasurer; John Gill, Subscription Manager; J.C. Michael Allen, Alexander Blair, Barbara Jackson.
Art Work: John Kolb

(A quarterly journal published by the students of Episcopal Theological School, 99 Brattle Street, Cambridge 38, Mass. Single copies 25¢, one-year subscription postpaid $1 to be sent to the Subscription Manager at the above address)

editorial

Henry Luce's press, always ready with faint praise to damn the "small but vigorous" Protestant Episcopalians and their Gospel of Good Taste, gleefully circulated a poem, to the tune of "God Bless America," which apparently came out of the Anglican congress of a couple of years ago. "I am an Anglican, via media, boom boom" was the climax of that piece of doggerel, and the one positive statement in a series of Things We Are Not. To the children of darkness, this is doubtless what we appear to be: a well-heeled, well-educated society eager to disassociate ourselves from Everything Else, from the embarrassing commitments of the montanists on our left and of the papists on our right. But to us of the in-group, the picture is more complex. Commitment remains our highest concern above mere middle-wayfaring. Much of our soul-searching, especially in seminary, is a quest for a positive common ground, a clear understanding of the Things We Are, and of what we have undertaken to do for our Lord.

Presumably our work in this school is designed to provide us with the materials from which we derive our common ground, in which all Christians in all times and places have found their mission defined. What is happening? The ancient formulas of belief which have contained the church's message from the earliest times are being replaced by a new vocabulary: our ministry is becoming a matter of "meeting needs," salvation becomes "life-adjustment," and redemption, once thought to be through Christ alone, is turned over to the "redeeming fellowship." And is it any wonder? When the study of the materials becomes an end in itself, these intermediate concerns and commitments become

infected with the spirit of self-contained antiquarianism, and no longer serve the Church's purpose. The Church, always eager to play at things outside its proper area of concern, comes dangerously close to sterilizing its own traditions through the misuse of methods which the scholarly world, who discovered them, has long since outgrown. No wonder so much of our preaching and teaching avoids the Scriptures and Traditions of the Church, and finds its rationalization in the meeting of emotional needs. A crude simile may help make this clear. We Christians are committed to a picture which we see with the eyes of faith. Sound learning recognizes and rightly so, that this picture is a jigsaw puzzle with some pieces missing and some pieces simply not fitting in anywhere. As Christians, our proper course is to remain committed to the picture as a whole, accepting the "cosmic anxiety" which this involves. But we do not always do this. A dissociation of sensibility creeps in, and in fear we leave the gospel to the scholars and go about doing another job--good work, but not the Lord's work. Unwilling to accept the anxieties of faith in the undemonstrable, we find the message of salvation not in the unseen Lord but in the visible community. Judgment is intolerable, redemption unnecessary, sin a regrettable fantasy.

So the centers of interest, the secondary commitments, drift apart. Instead of seeing in the experience of the Church in the past the strength of its message and the call to preach that message, we commit these concerns to the antiquarians who have failed to communicate them to us. And the other center of interest, our growing knowledge of human nature, likewise becomes an end in itself. Everyone is an expert in one thing or another, too absorbed in the fascinations of pedantry or of psychoanlysis to remember that these

(to page 27)

revitalizing roxbury

By The Rev. John Harmon
Rector of St. John's Church
Roxbury, Massachusetts

It sometimes appears that the Episcopal Church is determined to renounce its opportunity and deny its capacity for meeting the problems of the inner city, and to allow this area of its responsibility to die a respectable death. Today the retreat has become so widespread and so conspicuous that we can no longer cloak it under the guise of prudence. That it has finally hit the conscience of the Church is indicated by the five-year program instituted by the Urban-industrial Division of the National Council. This Division is working in cooperation with certain dioceses trying to find "reproducible techniques" for maintaining and improving the Church's ministry to city-dwellers. St. John's Roxbury is one of the twelve parishes in the nation in which this search is being carried on. So while it is far too early to give more than some very rough reflections on our work at St. John's, we feel that these few observations will give some idea of what we are trying to do.

A project of this kind requires a point of reference, so we begin with certain generalizations about the Christian Church in its primitive condition. There are at least three basic qualities of the early church which we can think of as determining its character. (1) The early church was primarily an urban church. This gives the lie to the widely held assumption that the only possible course for inner-city and depressed area parishes to follow is an orderly withdrawal to the suburbs: "The tide is going out" is

one Bishop's way of expressing this view. (2) The early church was inclusive. It was a new race, which willingly renounced all the distinctions the world adores, to enter an un-segregated fellowship. This fact pinpoints another modern lie, - that we must leave each to minister to his own kind, and seek for our fellowship only those of similar language, social status, and skin coloration. (3) The early church centered its life in the Eucharist. Each had his part to do, and together the Body regularly met its resurrected Lord. Fortunately the modern liturgical movement is seeking to revive this orientation, lifting it above both the bitter barriers of churchmanship and the "unhappy divisions" with which the Body has been perforated.

In brief, then, these three observations have been our determining points of reference. Having set them forth, I wish now to examine each one in more detail. For not only are they extremely important in themselves; in addition, we have been able to derive from them our two working principles: intensiveness and parochialism. I shall outline how we arrived at these principles, and then illustrate their application in the life of St. John's.

We would oversimplify the problem if we said that because the early church was primarily urban, the Gospel of Christ should meet no really threatening obstacles in the modern city. Boston is not Ephesus or Corinth; and "the least, the last, and the lost," that fill New York and Chicago are in circumstances far different from those of their brethren who once lived in Jerusalem. The growth of the "retreat-to-the-suburbs" strategy has been nourished by the hard facts of a changing situation. And the tendency of Bishops to fill marginal city missions with two-job or semi-retired clergy is due less to

the desire of their ambitious seminarians for stepping-stone appointments than to the discouraging complexities of modern urban sociology. Three elements of this complexity come at once into mind: mobility, contiguity, anonymity. It is unlikely that St. Paul ever had these to contend with in such measure; his "perils in the city" were of a different nature.

We have responded to this situation by adopting the principle of intensiveness, as distinguished from extensiveness. Against such opposition we have chosen to concentrate on a few essentials instead of trying to develop anything like an extensive social-service program. The Church School, of which I shall have more to say, is one of these essentials; another, based on our third principle of the life of the early church, is the regular participation in the Eucharist. We have maintained the well-established liturgical tradition of the parish, even though the social context in which it first flourished has changed radically. Offertory procession, Gospel procession, no imperialistic choir to deprive the people of their part in the liturgy, service music and station music printed in the leaflet--we are hopeful that these and other aspects will make the weekly Parish Eucharist the intensive climax and integrating focus of the week just past and of the week to come.

When we put the inclusive nature of the church into more modern terms, we can see two opposing principles at work: the congregational principle and the parochial. I am speaking now in terms not of church polity, but rather of church policy. The congregational principle (never too openly avowed because it is so obviously unscriptural) says: "Let's bring into the fellowship our own sort, and leave 'them' to theirs." Or, in the words of a Bishop who

had sold what had been a "white" Episcopal church to an all-colored African Methodist-Episcopal group: "They can minister to their own much better than we." On the other hand, the parochial principle says that we will minister to whoever comes within what we consider to be our parish boundaries, to all sorts and conditions. We cannot draw any ethnic, economic, or social lines unless we want to make "new thorns to pierce that steady brow." If it means that to do this effectively we will have to change some of our polite presuppositions and fond habits, then without question we will give these up.

These are our principles. How, then, are they applied in the daily life of a parish? I can only offer as a provisional answer a description of what we have been doing at St. John's.

Intensive vs. Extensive Four years ago our Church School looked like a majority of those in marginal, "the-neighborhood-has-certainly-changed" parishes: a hurried 45 minutes on Sunday morning. Even the educating power of the Eucharist and the devotion of the teachers were not enough to train children to "love whatsoever things are true and pure and lovely and of good report, following the example of the Saviour Jesus Christ;" - not in an area which has the highest court load for juvenile delinquency in the state. Adopting the experience of our Vacation Bible School, we shifted into a 3 hour School on Saturday mornings, calling it a 2-day School to guard against the neglect of Sunday. It grew into a 3-day School when recreation was shifted onto Tuesday afternoon, under the guidance of Canterbury volunteers. Curriculum-wise we are still feeling our way and are very eclectic, since we have no ready-made materials for such an arrangement. The scheme has proved worth while, in terms of the growth both of the

student body and of the number of parents who have been attracted into the parish through our intensive concern for their children. From 9 to 9:30 there is free play in the parish hall (dodge ball, rope jumping, checkers, etc.); then to classes (crafts, content-material, trips to museums, etc.); at 11:30 we all gather in church for instruction, announcements and prayers. Perhaps the chief advantage of this system is that on our small class arrangement, with a wide spread of time, it is possible for teachers to really develop warm relationships with their children, which is the sine qua non of all good teaching. The dominant factor is no longer a rigid time schedule, which is an open invitation to frayed nerves and desperation-discipline.

Parochial vs. Congregational Roxbury is a multi-racial area; the Rectory sits on a street which rather resemvles the United Nations. The dominant racial immigration since the turn of the century has been Negro. Around world war I, while one "white" Episcopal parish in the area was actively rejecting Negroes (it later went out of existence), St. John's accepted its "parochial" responsibility and welcomed them. As a result, the complexion of St. John's resembles the complexion of the area.

Recently another ethnic group entered the area, - a Spanish-speaking Cuban group, a number of whom have Anglican backgrounds. Since a majority of them are not yet bi-lingual, we have special monthly Eucharists in Spanish and a Spanish column in our parish paper. It is naturally our aim to incorporate them eventually in our regular parish worship, and this is beginning to take place. And at the last annual meeting one of their number was elected to the Vestry.

Our latest venture in obedience to the parochial principle has been the establishment of St. John's workshop. Convinced that

the walls of a church can impede real contact and communication with an area such as ours (no matter how many "Welcome!!" signs are put outside), we rented the ground floor of an adjacent store and moved our parish offices there, in company with a small Chapel for the Daily Offices, a shop selling used clothes and "religious articles," and some chairs to lounge around in. Parish volunteers have been secured to man the establishment and keep it open during most of the week. The chief benefit is obvious: we are much more available than when we were officed at the end of a dim corridor behind walls which only the most skillful and experienced panhandler would dare penetrate. We can wave to people as they pass; we can use the windows for display; and people no longer fear to enter when they can scout out the territory before opening the door.

It has become increasingly apparent that unless some such principles as these are consciously maintained two unhappy results will occur; we will in time desert the inner city (except for the big, well-endowed preaching stations), leaving untold souls stranded and practicing a sort of absentee segregationism; and we will totally fail the urban situation, a situation which many believe the Anglican Communion is actually better prepared to meet than any other portion of Christ's flock.

Judas speaks from the tree

By Robert C. S. Deacon

Who was the disciple that Jesus loved? New Testament scholars through the ages have been asking this question. The trouble with the answer proposed so far is that no one has approached the problem with an open mind. If the correct answer is to be found, all presuppositions, both theological and literary, must be cast aside and the actual text read for what it is worth.

"The disciple whom Jesus loved..." This is what the text says. Are we justified in assuming that this disciple loved Jesus? Does the text say this? Unfortunately, it does not. The text simply says that Jesus loved the disciple, and no more. If the critics had seen this at the outset, a great deal of unnecessary writing on the subject could have been avoided, and the heart of the matter laid bare at once. In fact, as we shall see, the disciple did not love Jesus. In his use of the bitterly ironic expression, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the editor of the Fourth Gospel perpetrated one of the most monstrous hoaxes of all time. Centuries of biblical criticism have done nothing to set the matter aright.

The crucial text is John 21:20-22.

> Peter turned and saw following them the disciple whom Jesus loved, who had lain close to His breast at the supper and had said, "Lord, who is it that is going to betray you?" when Peter saw him, he said to Jesus, "Lord, what about this man?" Jesus said to him, "If it be my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you? Follow me!"

The meaning of this passage is transparently clear. Peter asked Jesus if the beloved disciple were to die. Jesus said He would take care of him in His own way. Apparently Jesus found it necessary to hold Peter back, for He added a restraining "Follow me!"

What was this disciple's crime that he should be worth of death? How was it that Peter, who had denied Jesus, was able so to judge this man? The answer is obvious; this man, the disciple whom Jesus loved, had betrayed his Master. This man was Judas Iscariot.

This conclusion clears up many other questions in the Fourth Gospel.

1. The beloved disciple was reclining next to Jesus at the last supper. In such a position he could easily have received the sop unobserved by the others, as the text tells us Judas did.

2. The question of the beloved disciple, "Lord, who is it that is going to betray you?" echoes Judas' question in Matthew, "Lord, is it I?"

3. The disciple whom Jesus loved is not mentioned at the last supper after the departure of Judas.

4. The association of the beloved disciple with Peter can easily be understood if this disciple is Judas, the man who betrayed Jesus, for Peter is the man who denied Jesus.

5. An unidentified disciple entered the court of the high priest with Jesus. Who among the disciples was known to the chief priests? Precisely Judas, and he might have entered the court to give evidence against Jesus, or possibly to attempt to undo the wrong that he had done.

6. Finally we have the word from the Cross in which Jesus committed His own mother to this disciple. Could this not have been our Lord's one last attempt to redeem this man?

But why did the editor of the Fourth Gospel attempt to conceal the identity of this disciple? To answer this question we must go beyond the Fourth Gospel itself to the tradition of the early Church. From the first chapter of Acts, it is apparent that Judas was alive shortly after the Resurrection. This fact would have been intolerable to later Christians, like the editor of the Fourth Gospel, who were not always so completely dominated by the forgiving love of the risen Christ as were those who had been present at the Resurrection appearances. The editor of the Fourth Gospel, faced with the moral impossibility of the traitor's presence after the Resurrection, had to do something about it. And so he did. He could allow the unfavorable references to Judas to stand, and, in fact, every reference to Judas in the Fourth Gospel is unfavorable. But the favorable and morally neutral references he could not allow, and so, meticulously, he changed every such reference. As the crowning touch, in place of the name of the traitor, he used the cryptic and bitterly ironic expression, "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

And so we see that one of the deepest insights of the Gospel has been lost to the Church for centuries. Even though Judas Iscariot was the one who betrayed Him, our Lord loved him. All Christians should take heart. We daily betray our Lord, and yet, he loves us.

segregation: a sermon

By William Brown Patterson

"Almighty God, who has created man in thine own image: grant us grace fearlessly to content against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and, that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations, to the glory of thy holy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

A Southerner who returns to him home just now, after a sojourn in the North, is likely to feel very much like the Northerner who recently visited the South and wrote,

> "It gives me a queer feeling to be at the center of the greatest social crisis of my time and see hardly a sign of it." (E.B. White, New Yorker)

Indeed, one may not even hear of it unless he himself introduces the subject in conversation. There is remarkably little discussion of racial relations on the radio, in the newspapers, from the pulpit. Even Southern politicians have recently become uncharacteristically close-mouthed on the subject.

And yet, in spite of all this treading softly--indeed partly because of it-- one senses a more powerful complex of emotions working under the surface than the South has known in decades.

There is Tension. Some Southerners, together with prominent elected officials, have taken what seems to be a final and unalterable stand that segregation bars will not be lowered; while other Southerners, and the federal government, are equally unyielding in their demands that they must be.

There is Frustration. Many Southerners feel strongly that the region which furnished invaluable leadership to the Republic in its formative years has now been robbed of the authority to solve its own problems in its own way. Many other Southerners, having won rights promised to them so long ago, find that they are constrained from exercising them.

There is Uncertainty and Confusion. The whole South, accustomed to at least the appearance of a stable society, has discovered that none of its institutions is secure from compulsory change. And while the old order is being broken up, what was in many places an easy, tolerant relation between the races is being replaced by hostility, economic reprisals, and occasional violence.

Many in the South feel very much like the little boy who sat in front of me on the train a few nights ago. He was only three years old and he was having difficulty sleeping while "The Peach Queen" started and jerked and backed and jolted. In fact, in spite of his mother's attention, he more than once fell off the seat. Finally, about 3:30 a.m., after several encounters with the floor, he looked up and said,

"Mama, we got to find us a house and get out of this mess."

It is not only the South but the whole nation which needs to find a house in this time of crisis, ill-will, and confusion. For the racial problem is a national problem, and we have nowhere found a completely satisfactory solution to it. New thoughts and new actions are both required. Our law and constitution provide us with one set of guideposts, but these are insufficient, since what we need is not so much a set of answers for specific situations as a complete change of heart. Can our religion give us that?

Jesus said nothing about freeing the slaves in his own time, nor did St. Paul,

who seemed rather to support the social status quo. The Church, through most of its history, has shown little interest in social and economic reform, confining itself for the most part to giving alms to the poor and forbidding usury. The social gospel, in the form we know it, scarcely pre-dates the 19th century.

But the teachings of Jesus were not intended to be a codified law, with provisions to govern every human situation. In fact, it was against such a law that his teachings were often directed. He came to show us the right relation between man and God and man and man.

"Love thy neighbour as thyself"--this he called one of the two great commandments. And in his life and teaching he showed us clearly who our neighbours are. The Jews and the Samaritans are neighbours, he taught, though the Samaritans were considered by the Jews, racially, morally, and socially inferior. The lepers are neighbours, though they are diseased and unclean. Jesus showed his love for them by healing them and talking to them and treating them with dignity. The woman taken in adultery is a neighbour, though she is despised for her moral laxity. For her Jesus asked tolerance and forgiveness. The tax collector is a neighbour, though he is hated as a member of a class of exploiters. Jesus called one of them to be his disciple. The Roman soldier in the army of occupation is a neighbour, though he is detested by Jews who love their country. Jesus healed the daughter of a Roman centurion. All races, nationalities, classes, professions, "all sorts and conditions of men" are our neighbours, and are to be treated with kindness, love, and understanding.

Jesus called men to be the children of God. He taught us to pray to "Our father, who art in heaven..." If God is our father,

and we are his children, then we are all of us brothers, and the differences between us fade into insignificance. Jesus loved all men, including those who were shunned and despised in his own time. He loved them, not for their estate in life nor their race nor their righteousness, but because they were human beings, creatures of God, children of God. He manifested God's love for man in the actions of his life, by associating with the outcasts and sinners whom society ostracized; he loved, taught, healed, helped men in every condition of life. His manifestation of God's love culminated in his death on the Cross. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son..." (John 3:16) Jesus died to save all men, everywhere.

Our answer to the question of racial relations, then, lies within the New Testament teachings about Christian Love and the Brotherhood of Man. All men are our neighbours and are to be treated with love, as fellow members of God's family on earth. God loves every member of this family and each one of us is precious to him. There cannot be any doubt that insofar as our spiritual rights and privileges are concerned, all men are created as equals. Once we accept this fact, we cannot rest content that in our own great nation men's civil and social rights and privileges depend upon the colour of their skin. Do we not pray in every single church service we attend, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven."

What are we to do about it?

In areas of the country where segregation has the force of law, this whole principle must be broken forever. Legally enforced segregation is the greatest of mischief-makers, because it creates precisely the wrong moral atmosphere. It is almost impossible to treat the Negro as an individual human being when the Law, with all the

mystique which surrounds it, has declared that he is a member of a class or a group which is to be set apart. It is not nearly so important to combine white and coloured schools, to mix the races in recreational areas, to allow Negroes in the choice seats on trains and buses, as it is to break the principle of segregation, with quite small numbers if necessary, in every sphere of life.

Mr. Thurgood Marshall had his finger on this truth when he was interviewed a few weeks ago. He said that the core of his concern was not the Negro but the individual human being. Other people were engaged in efforts to improve the standards and status of the Negroes as a race, he said, and that was a worthy cause, but it wasn't his cause. The great contribution America had made to the world was in establishing a society whose law and government were based on a fundamental belief in individual worth, individual opportunity, and individual responsibility, and Marshall's cause, as he saw it, was to make that idea, which had long been grievously thwarted in the case of many Americans into a reality.

What is at the moment of crucial importance in the South is a moral issue. A Southern state, in order to preserve scholastic standards, might be justified in imposing health tests, intelligence tests, or aptitude tests on those seeking admission to the best schools. But not the racial test. There is no room in the Christian doctrines of human brotherhood and love for the racial test. What is needed in the South is action, yes, but more important, a whole new attitude of mind. In the framework of Christian thought we cannot treat the Negro as a raper of white women or as a beloved family retainer. He is neither: he is an individual human being, with all the worth and dignity, rights

and privileges, of one of the children of God.

What about other parts of the country? Our tendency is to say that the moral principle has been established here, and what is chiefly necessary is to eliminate such inequalities as still remain. It is certainly true that there is a great deal to be done in the way of completing the Negro's rise to full citizenship. The pressure tactics and riots which some neighbourhoods in the Midwest have used to prevent Negro families from moving in are in glaring contradiction to America's publicly-professed ideals. The North should strive to be the best possible example to the South, because a demonstration of amicable relations on the basis of equality is the most effective argument that could be presented on the federal government's side.

But it is important in the North, as in the South, to give fresh attention to the moral and religious question we have been discussing here. Our Christian aim is to treat the Negro not as a race, nor as a class, nor even as a social problem, but as an individual human being. Having granted him equal civil rights, we must accept him as a person. "Love thy neighbour" means that we treat men of all nationalities, races, professions, and estates with the consideration due fellow-children of God. We must strive all over the country to secure equal public rights for all our citizens. But we must also open our hearts to the Christian message of love and brotherhood, and by means of it transform our private actions and our very attitude of mind.

the philosopher and the ass
or the ass and the philosopher

By Charles L. Bennett

A man, whilst walking down a road,
Espied a long-eared quadruped.
"Doubtless," he said, "you are an ass."
"So what," the donkey said.

The man drew back, somewhat aghast,
And said to him, "Kind Jack,
I beg your pardon for the affront,
But might I utilize your back?"

Now Jack was not the dullest wit
That's walked upon the road;
He perceived at once, behind the man's back,
A long and cruel goad.

Aha, thought Jack, t'would be unwise
To give this fellow trump.
And what could be worse than a day in June
On the road with a goad on my rump?

Jack thought and thought and thought and thought
To see his way through the pickle,
When all at once he came to his wits,
And his ears began to tickle.

Jack twitched them right, he twitched them left,
'Til all at once the man,
Perceived the uncommon phenomenon,
And sat upon the sand.

T'was his turn to think and think and think,
And think he did (so they have it),

When suddenly the man perceived
That the ass was no ass but a rabbit.

The man at once withdrew apace,
Or two or three or four;
And I ask you in all seriousness,
Which ass loved philosophy more?

koinonia in cambridge

By John H. Snow

One Saturday morning last fall a reluctant dozen, composed of six seminarians and six priests of diverse levels of churchmanship gathered for an early Celebration in a local parish. There could be little enough enthusiasm in a group regretting their one opportunity for sleeping in and making no attempt to conceal their misgivings about the possibility of any community of interest developing out of so motley a company. The meeting was the result of a plan, conceived by a group of local parish priests and their student assistants, for a program of regular weekly communion breakfasts. Diversity of principles, rather than party sympathy, was to characterize the membership. So they came together with reservations not lightly to be dispelled; they have been coming together ever since.

Through the year this group has battled and talked and thought and loved its way to a sense of fulfilled community without precedent in the experience of any of its members. What may appear to be a latter-day miracle was realized, by the simplest and most traditional means: the means prescribed by the earliest Church. The Holy Communion, followed by a breakfast -- a good, big breakfast -- followed in turn by discussion -- a good, big discussion, with plenty of room for the Holy Spirit.

Each week, some aspect of the day's discussion which has attracted the special concern of the group is chosen for the topic of the following week's meeting. The topics have been various: desegregation, Fear, Loneliness, Authority, What to do with the

Y.P.F., whom do we want for Suffragan Bishop and why; two sessions were devoted to a proposed revival of the Sacrament of Penance. Out of this last battle, so central in general issues of churchmanship, came a remarkable compromise, which deepened the Catholics' conception of confession and the Evangelicals' understanding of Absolution. The pastoral approach of both groups was made more effective through this discussion.

What about the Seminarians? They are permitted on these mornings to bring all of the learning supplied them at ETS to bear on the practical problems of the parish ministry and to test its relevance. Since they are not fully involved in the parish situations, they supply a degree of objectivity which has proved instrumental in destroying all the barriers to community. Most important, they have hope. The feeling of fragmentation, of aimlessness and division which is so often our mood in seminary has been healed in this wonderful unity of love, where we can miraculously be ourselves, say what we think, look closely at reality and find it good.

spoken e.t.s.

By Jeremy H. Knowles

Spring brought an expedition of some thirty eager ministerial prospects within the hallowed walls of E.T.S. In formal lectures in Reed Hall, in informal non-directive dorm discussions, at tea at Hodges House (alias 101), and in extracurricular activities at the O.G., this promising segment of young manhood encountered (I-Thou fashion) the Christian imperative and their vocation.

It may be hoped that our relations with the outside world will be stimulated by this and similar exchange programs. Only a small number of these men may ever enter the ordained ministry. But that is not the important thing. What counts is that they have known, for one glorious moment, E.T.S.

Or have they?

No, in shame we must confess that one of the most meaningful and enriching aspects of our life here has been denied them. They have not learned Spoken E.T.S.

Steps must be taken to alleviate this ghastly situation. If we want to meet people where we are, we must let them feel out felt needs. Things as they stand are really the least. How can the newcomer escape being shook? Not knowing the shibboleth, he cannot be one of the group. He feels threatened, frustrated, rejected.

I propose that a Handy Guide to Spoken E.T.S. be prepared. In it the fast-moving neophyte could be clued in on the straight scoop. In no time at all he would have it made in the shade.

First come easy phrases. Then these are built up into complete sentences. As a

test of proficiency there will be a collectio of refectory announcements to be translated from English into Spoken E.T.S.

To those who actually come to E.T.S., I think we have an added obligation. Perhaps Spoken E.T.S. (Advanced) would do the job. This booklet would make everyone who read it a real winner of tigrine proportions, when otherwise he might become a real loser, all bent out of shape.

Special chapters would point up the effectiveness of Spoken E.T.S. in existential situations: "Impressing Your Maid;" "Snappy Kitchen Repartee;" "Keeping Up with Your Y.P.F."

After several hours with this little volume, the E.T.S. recruit would be thoroughly shaped up. He would know when to move out and when to move in. He would feel, in short, like a real rose.

providence and freedom

By Edwin Stube

The President of the Women's Auxiliary, and representatives of the Men's Bible Class and of the Parents' Class came to Jesus and tested him saying:

"We know that God is omnipotent and omniscient, and that he creates and controls all things; and yet we have heard that you teach the freedom of men's wills. If God knows all things before they happen and controls all things including us, how can it be that we have freedom of choice and action?"

Perceiving that someone had been troubling them, Jesus spoke to them in a parable, saying:

"A certain man was a Discussion Group Leader at his church. And, being a conscientious man, he made thorough preparation for the Discussion Group Meeting. Before he went, he studied all he could about the subject to be discussed and understood it fully.

"When the Discussion Group Members were assembled for the Discussion Group Meeting, the Discussion Group Leader outlined briefly the limits of the topic to be discussed and set up the rules for the Discussion. After this he leaned back in his chair and permitted the Discussion Group Members to discuss freely among themselves.

"At an appropriate moment about two-thirds of the way through the hour, the Discussion Group Leader spoke a few sentences which reoriented the Discussion and indicated to the Discussion Group Members what his point of view was. Then he again leaned back and allowed them to discuss freely for the

remainder of the hour.

"At the very end, he spoke up once more. This time he summarized briefly and organized what the Discussion Group Members had said in the course of the hour.

"And, behold, these results corresponded exactly with the understanding which he had had from the beginning.

"Now, what think ye? Did the Discussion Group Leader control the Discussion, or were the Discussion Group Members free to discuss as they would?"

The President of the Women's Auxiliary, and the representatives of the Men's Bible Class and of the Parent's Class answered and said: "Both things are true."

Jesus said, "Go, then, and choose and do that which is the will of God."

things are but tools entrusted to our use for a purpose which transcends both.

That "blessed liberty wherewith Christ hath set us free," and which the Anglican Communion has been so diligent to preserve, places upon us responsibilities unknown to those in bondage. If the "middle way" becomes a dead center of apathy, or if that liberty is taken as license to follow "erroneous and strange doctrines contraty to God's word," a bondage is upon us worse than the Law: a bondage to the limitations of men without God.